



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,719	03/11/2004	Christian Herzum	1890-0066	5006

7590 06/22/2006

Maginot, Moore & Beck LLP
Chase Tower
Suite 3250
111 Monument Circle
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5109

EXAMINER

CAO, PHAT X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2814

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 10/798,719		Applicant(s) HERZUM ET AL.	
Examiner Phat X. Cao		Art Unit 2814	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 14-21.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached papers.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

ADVISORY ACTION

1. With respect to the base claim 14, Applicant argues that AAPA fails to disclose the shielding 42 displaced from the substrate by “a predetermined displacement” of between 500 nm and 250 nm.

It is noted that Applicant cannot read limitations only set forth in the description into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. *In re Sporck*, 386 F.2d 924, 155 USPQ 687 (CCPA 1967). In this case, the limitation on which Applicant relies (i.e., between 500 nm and 250 nm) is not stated in the base claim 14. It is the claims that claimed invention, and it is claims, not specifications that are anticipated or unpatentable. *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices Inc.*, 7 USPQ2d 1064. Therefore, AAPA does suggest “the portion covering the side face of the gate facing the drain area terminating at an end displaced from the substrate by a predetermined displacement” as claimed because the shielding 42 is displaced from the substrate by a displacement delta, “which is set between the drain area 16 and the end of the first portion 42a” (see page 3, lines 31-33 of Applicant’s specification).

2. With respect to dependent claim 18, Applicant argues that it would not be obvious to set a predetermined displacement delta of AAPA in a range as claimed because the predetermined displacement as claimed is not recognized in the art to be a result-effective variable.

It is noted that Applicant states on page 10, line 38 through page 11, lines 1-4 that:

"...The third portion 42c is formed as a shield over the gate polysilicon 22 and reaches down on the drain side so that it shows a distance to the underlying area which is referred to as delta similar to Fig. 1B and 2."

From the above statement, it appears that the delta displacement shown in Fig. 1B (AAPA) is equivalent to the delta displacement shown in Fig. 2 (Applicant's invention). Therefore, the delta displacement of AAPA (Fig. 1B) would also provide the same expected result of reduction of the feed back capacity and increasing in the maximum stable gain. Thus, if Applicant believes that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the delta displacement of AAPA, then Applicant is requested to support that position with facts.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phat X. Cao whose telephone number is 571-272-1703. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on 571-272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PC
June 19, 2006


PHAT X. CAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER